

APPROVED
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
21 June 2001

Projects Reviewed

Convened: 8:30am

Civic Center Signage Master Plan
Seattle Public Utilities
 Landslide Mitigation Program
Department of Parks and Recreation
 Major Maintenance Projects
South Lake Union Park
Waterfront Streetcar Improvement Project

Adjourned: 4:00pm

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse
Tom Bykonen
Ralph Cipriani
David Spiker
Sharon Sutton
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Layne Cubell
Brad Gassman
Sally MacGregor

21 June 2001 Project: Civic Center Signage Master Plan

Phase: Briefing

Presenters: Eric LeVine, NBBJ

Brad Tong, Shiels, Oblatz, Johnsen, SOJ

Attendee: Ken Johnsen, Shiels, Oblatz, Johnsen, SOJ

Time: 1.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00143)

(SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00139)

(SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00119)

Action: The Commission appreciates the briefing and makes the following comments and recommendations:

- commends the team for the comprehensive approach to this project;
- hopes that the Civic Center signage graphic information will unify the downtown Civic precinct and the character of this area;
- urges the team to analyze the use of the term “Seattle Civic Center,” which might be confused with Seattle Center;
- encourages the team to further develop the identification of specific buildings within the Civic Center comprehensive signage program;
- recommends that the team integrate the signage master plan and design with the landscape, art, and architectural design of individual projects;
- suggests that City publications and stationery include clear location information that correlates with the wayfinding and information signs;
- recommends that the graphic signage program focus on the re-design and clarification of the base of Key Tower;
- investigate the potential use of simple technologies (i.e. telephone help) and not just high-tech kiosks to augment the graphics program and to ensure broad access;
- consider the use of fewer typefaces to simplify the graphics program;
- urges the team to reduce the clutter of the site that is often caused by an abundance of signs and kiosks; and
- recommends and supports the use of public mock-ups to test the graphics program.

The Civic Center Signage Master Plan is a comprehensive plan to develop the wayfinding graphics and identification graphics for the many City offices and buildings, including the Justice Center, Key Tower, and the future City Hall. The team has been working to define the key functional needs and develop the design guidelines and aesthetic criteria for the Civic Center signage. The mission of the signage is: *to empower and inspire the user by developing a graphics system that enhances wayfinding and reinforces the identity of Seattle Civic Center.* Throughout the development of the process, the team has sought input from many relevant groups to better define the users needs.

The team has proposed a broad overall approach to support the notion of a single noticeable unified campus. There would be a central information core, and the team has also identified where the system of supporting components should be. The first type of signage would be wayfinding signage. Many people will be coming to the Civic Center, and the team has considered the different means by which people

would obtain information to determine where to come. Wayfinding signage would address pedestrians, drivers, and transit users to get to the appropriate site. Through the use of wayfinding signage, the team hopes to keep people from parking in the wrong areas and being forced to retrace steps. The team also recognized the need for the wayfinding signage to address different physical disabilities. The second type of signage would be identification signage. Identification signage would provide directory maps at the perimeter of site that would notify people of the appropriate buildings for different types of services. If the full range of information cannot be provided at these locations, the identification signs would direct people to a central information location in the City Hall concierge area. The identity signage would also be located at buildings, identifying the City offices located inside.

The team stated that there is a need to create a sense of the place at the perimeter of the Civic Center area through the logo, texture, and color of the signage. The team presented a variety of case studies for different types of people with different motives who may come to the Civic Center. The team also investigated the needs of non-familiar users with very general information.

The team also feels that the stationery sent from each City office should include a specific address and directions that are visually and informationally consistent with the signage at the Civic Center. The team is working with DO IT to integrate the signage with the City's information system. Through the Civic Center Signage Master Plan, the team hopes that the user experience would be consistent and clear from home to the Civic Center.

The team has developed aesthetic design criteria for Civic Center signage. The team identified the need for sophisticated, dignified, simple and straightforward signage. If graphic imagery were used, historical and cultural references would be critical. The materials and color should be consistent as well; the colors should represent Seattle's natural environment and the connection to the materials of the urban environment. While the use of accent colors is suggested, to enliven designs and add to visibility, the signs should be white to allow maximum visibility. The typeface should be selected from a list of established options; the team presented four options, two with serifs and two without serifs. The team feels that the signs should be rectilinear forms. Through the signage master plan, the team hopes to avoid clutter and oversigning.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Commends the team for the thorough presentation and level of detail. Would like to know if the team has identified the need for international symbols to promote universal symbol recognition for people in a hurry and visitors from other countries.
- Recognizes that the City Hall will become an architectural feature of the city. Feels that the day-to-day users will be visiting Key Tower for their frequent needs. Believes that there should also be a information concierge in Key Tower as well.
 - Proponents recognized this concern and stated that others have raised this issue. Further stated that the City Hall will attract many visitors, due to its significance, and an information concierge would be appropriate at this location.
- Recognizes the team's intent to maintain visual integrity without cluttering the signage system. Is concerned that there could be too much of an emphasis on the Civic Center as a whole. However, many people will be coming to this area with a specific purpose, whether it is to get a building permit or attend a City Council meeting. Believes that the signage should reflect the need for specific building identification, rather than naming the entire area a Civic Center.
 - Proponents agreed that the Civic Center theme should not be the overriding consistency

throughout the signage.

- Is concerned that the sans serif typeface is very similar to the signage at Seattle Center. Is concerned that “Seattle Civic Center” may be confused with “Seattle Center.” Hopes that “Seattle Civic Center” will not be the most prominent graphic.
 - Proponents stated that the “Seattle Center” typeface is actually fairly different. Further stated that this concern has been raised before. Further stated that they will examine the level of emphasis of the use of the phrase “Civic Center” versus the names of the buildings.
- Suggests that the team omit Seattle from “Seattle Civic Center” to reduce confusion.
 - Proponents stated that there is also a concern that people would include King County under the “Civic” umbrella.
- Believes that people will think of the individual buildings in which the City offices are located. Does not believe that it would be effective to create a logo or theme at the expense of the individual components. Encourages the team to not lose sight of the needed specificity.
 - Proponents agreed that if citizens received stationery that simply directed them to the Civic Center, they would be confused. Further agreed the Civic Center logo could be only at the site.
- Believes that Civic Center should be the identity only within the area and a feeling of the area downtown, but it should not be the identity outside of the place.
 - Proponents stated that they have been working with the open space design team.
- Encourages the team to think creatively about signage typology, some people may not be computer-savvy. Would like to know if there is another way that technology could be used. Is not sure that a flat image could appropriately represent the experience of this space, with many extremes presented by the weather, and/ or geography.
- Encourages the team to examine signage color in relation to the building colors and materials, in particular the City Hall “red wall” at the main open space.
- Believes that the landscape design would provide the strongest sense of place, and would like to know if there will be coordination between the signage design team and the landscape design team.
 - Proponents stated that they have been working with the open space team. The design guidelines for the signage have been reduced to reflect the notion that the landscape design of the open space will provide the strongest sense of place through grander gestures.
- Suggests that stationery originating from City offices could have a 3-dimensional image in an upper corner on which the individual offices may be identified by a black dot in a three dimensional representation of a building.
- Suggests that the main building identification could be displayed as “Key Tower at Civic Center,” for example.
 - Proponents stated that the client group has also suggested this approach.
- Recognizes that other cities have taken this approach, and have abandoned the idea. Feels that building identification should be unique to the building. Would like to know how the City buildings outside of the Civic Center five would be included in the signage system, such as the Arctic Building. Would like to know if the name for Key Tower would change. Feels that the emphasis of the building should be more important the idea of Civic Center.

- Proponents stated that the naming rights for Key Tower would end in 2004.
- Believes that there should not be four typefaces. Feels that, because it is the twenty-first century, a sans-serif typeface is more appropriate. Believes that the typeface should be varied by size and boldness and the graphics program would be stronger with a fewer number of typefaces.
 - Proponents stated that they were hoping to allow the individual sign designers to work with more flexibility within the set parameters. Further stated that a typeface with serifs would be appropriate for buildings of this stature.
- Hopes that the signage system will become integrated with the architectural and landscape design. Is concerned that the space could become cluttered with signs, kiosks, or boards. Believes that, as signs are integrated with the building design, the locations of signs should be lower and closer to the ground.
 - Proponents stated that there is currently a debate in the sign industry now, and the common belief is that people hope to use current and new technologies. Further stated that the signs may be placed within a niche in the wall.
- Encourages the team to recognize the additional need to direct people out of the building as well.
 - Proponents agreed and stated that signs within the building would direct people to exits, parking, transit stops, etc.

21 June 2001 Project: Seattle Public Utilities Landslide Mitigation Program

Phase: Briefing

Previous Review: 3 May 2001 (Design Briefing- Marine View Drive Landslide Mitigation)

Presenter: Cheryl Paston, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

Time: 1.25 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00235)

Actions: The Commission appreciates the thorough briefing on the background and history of Seattle Public Utility's Landslide Mitigation Program and makes the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Commission feels that social justice aspects of this mitigation program should become a primary issue in the City's response to landslide concerns to ensure that there is an equitable use of economical and natural resources;**
- **encourages SPU to recognize the visual impact upon the general public for some of the mitigation projects and broaden its consideration of design and context; and**
- **hopes that the mitigation projects will be transparent, educational, and visually accessible to allow the public to know about the processes taking place.**

A representative from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) presented a briefing of the SPU Landslide Mitigation Program. SPU has retained complaints concerning landslides since 1890. This is a growing concern, as landslides are becoming more and more frequent. Typically, water has been involved in almost all cases, and human activity has been a significant factor as well. Due to slide damage in the early 1930's drainage tunnels and an enclosed system was developed and the WPA drainage program in Seattle was developed.

There are natural and human influences that typically cause landslides. Natural factors, all of which must be present, include steep slopes, soil types, and pronounced wet winters. Human factors include placement of fill material, excavation at middle or top of slope, improper drainage, broken or leaking pipes, imprudent cutting of vegetation, and lack of maintenance of drainage facilities. Legally, it is difficult to regulate some human influences, as people typically want to build on steep slopes because of the views; it is difficult to find an appropriate balance between regulations and takings. Landslides are mitigated through different measures, and this can be done through retaining walls, subsurface drainage facilities, catchment walls, springheads, crib walls, geotextile-reinforced slopes, and fill buttresses. The SPU representative presented drawings of different types of landslides. A deep-seated landslide causes more injuries, while a shallow colluvial (skin slide) is more common and can also be dangerous.

SPU works with other departments as a Landslide Policy Group to address landslides and the problems caused by landslides. The group must examine the conditions of landslides, and conditions prone to produce landslides, and determine the relationship between City responsibilities and private responsibilities, which is very complicated. The City must respond to emergency situations; for slide prevention, the City must take a proactive role and take steps to mitigate human influences. The City maintains drainage programs, completes storm drainage repairs, provides information to the public through a resource center, and enforces policies stated by various City departments. New private developers and property owners must follow strict restrictions, while established property owners located on the slope may have followed previous lax restrictions and may cause more problems. Some property owners question the policies and believe that the City should take more responsibility by stabilizing all of the open space, for example. However, some citizens do realize that they must take responsibility for

building property in certain locations.

The Landslide Mitigation Program continues through the development of policies and further activities. Citizen education is an important part of Council's adopted landslide policies. The refinement of policies and standards and enforcement of codes is also very important. Council's policies also focus on the need for further funding, perhaps through drainage fees or other sources. SPU, through a Seattle Landslide Study, has further defined the scope of the problem. The most recent landslides are concentrated in certain areas, and are of a typical type. SPU has investigated different triggering mechanisms, and has also identified programs to protect City land.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if there is oversight in the landslide mitigation program, similar to federally funded transportation programs. Frequently, landslides affect the affluent population, but the funding source for the mitigation is typically taxes that all populations pay. Believes that environmental justice should shape the mitigation program.
 - SPU representative stated that they are examining the big picture and do realize that the funding of the drainage system should be structured to equitably spend money. Further stated that they must spend money in the areas with the most problems.
- Believes that owner notification of certain conditions is lacking and may be a cause of the continuation of landslide problems. Believes that lenders should require structural investigations and sellers should disclose the landslide potential.
 - SPU representative stated that county assessors and insurance companies did request copies of the Seattle Landslide Study.
- Believes that City departments should take a proactive and ethical approach to these concerns. Hopes that the departments will investigate the economical and natural resources and the means by which these resources can be used for the greatest common good. Would like to know if there are provisions in the Land Use Code to protect these areas, and prohibit development in these areas.
 - SPU representative stated that many of the sites available for development are the sites with steep slopes. Further stated that the regulation might be considered a takings issue on some cases. Further stated that the City can reduce the amount of development, but the City must allow development. Further stated that if the City bought the steep slopes, the City would be actually purchasing more liability.
- Feels that there should be prohibitive fees for the development of a property on a steep slope. Recognizes that some problems are site specific, particularly in the cases of private homes. Feels that some mitigation options, such as a hillside covered with shotcrete, do create an unfavorable environment for the surrounding public. Feels that there is a public interest in examining private properties. Encourages SPU to examine mitigation alternatives that are most visually compatible with the context. Hope that future landslide mitigation efforts will be well designed and sustainable.
- At future project specific mitigation projects, would like the project managers to explain the design standards by which the project must comply to be aesthetically compatible with the context. Would like project managers to explain what is appropriate for the Commission to review, in the case of maintenance projects and CIP projects.

▪ **21 June 2001 Commission Business**

ACTION ITEMS

- A. TIMESHEETS
- B. MINUTES FROM 3 MAY 2001 AND 17 MAY 2001-
APPROVED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- C. DC RECRUITMENT UPDATE
- D. OUTSIDE COMMITMENT UPDATES-
- E. DESIGN REVIEW UPDATE

21 June 2001 Project: Department of Parks and Recreation Major Maintenance Projects

Phase: Briefing

Previous Review: 20 August 1998 (Briefing)

Presenter: Rich Hennings, Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR)

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00234)

The Design Commission met with Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) staff to get an update on the status of projects and discuss the 2001-2002 Capital Improvement Projects/ Major Maintenance Projects.

The Commission identified the following projects as ones which they would like to review in the future:

Aquarium
Arboretum Trail (Shoreline and Trail Improvements)
Jefferson Park
Riverview Playfield (Athletic Field Renovation)
Bradner Gardens Park (Comfort Station Renovation)
Langston Hughs (Cultural Arts Center Improvements)
Volunteer Park (Replacements and Renovations)
Neighborhood Response Program
Neighborhood Self-Help Program
Trail Renovation Projects
Greenwood Greenhouses
Luna Park (Seawall Replacement)
Washington Street Floating Dock (Renovation)
Chinese Garden (Development)
MOHAI (Downtown Facility Development)
Olympic Sculpture Park
Jefferson Golf Course (Maintenance Facility Renovation)
Lake Washington Boulevard (South- Path Renovation)
Lincoln Reservoir (Park Development)
Sand Point/ Magnuson Park (Wetlands Renovation)
Reforestation and Landscape Restoration (Comprehensive Update)
South Lake Union Park

21 June 2001 Project: South Lake Union Park

Phase: Briefing

Previous Review: 2 April 1998 (Briefing), 20 August 1998 (Update), 17 February 2000 (Briefing), 18 May 2000 (Scope Briefing/ Update)

Presenters: Don Harris, Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR)
Bob Sittig, Maritime Heritage Foundation
Nathan Torgelson, Office of Economic Development (OED)Attendees: Chris Kirk, Maritime Heritage Foundation
Lisa Raflo, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU)
Craig Webster, Maritime Heritage Foundation

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00051)

Action: The Commission appreciates the excellent presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission encourages the team to continue to push the boundaries to integrate the two uses of the site, South Lake Union Park and the Maritime Heritage Center, urging the team to select a consultant that can creatively address this collaborative client structure;
- supports the creative programming of the site that the team has identified, and hopes that this programming will maximize the public benefit and environmental education opportunities of the site;
- encourages the team to aggressively develop this site to influence the development of the adjacent area to implement the broad goals of the community and neighborhood; and
- commends the Maritime Heritage Foundation for their continued pursuit of redeveloping this site as a cultural resource, and believes that it will be a true gift, defining the region.

South Lake Union (SLU) Park, will be located along the southwest edge of South Lake Union, and will be adjacent to the Maritime Heritage Center. In the near future, eight portions of City property will be sold for development in the South Lake Union area; through this transaction, there will also be public benefits to reflect the public objectives of City Council. The proceeds may be used for further public benefits, such as transportation improvements and affordable housing in the South Lake Union neighborhood. Because it is a real estate transaction, the City did not specify the uses or building design that must be developed on the properties. City Investors, the purchaser of the 8 City properties, is contractually obligated to apply for development permits on the 4 parcels directly south of South Lake Union within a certain time period. The development of these portions is important in relation to SLU Park because public parking will be provided.

The team presented a concept illustration of possible development of South Lake Union Park. This plan complies with the current master plan, adopted by City Council. The City has been assembling the property for South Lake Union; there are approximately 12.5 acres of accumulated property. The City acquired the Navy property, which includes the armory building. DOPAR developed the master plan for the SLU Park; DOPAR felt that the entire area should be an urban park. However, the Center for Wooden Boats is an established, viable use. The team recognized that this is a feasibly permanent location for historic boats. The adopted master plan included SLU Park and the Maritime Heritage

Center; the master plan recognizes the neighborhood's desire to develop SLU Park as a focal point of the area. The master plan also emphasizes the need to maintain visual corridors to Lake Union from Terry Avenue, and the need to allow access for the public to the full waterfront. The team is seeking a consultant to implement the master plan to create an integrated park development with the Maritime Heritage Center. As this area will become an urban amenity, the team hopes to complement the current work on the Open Space Strategy.

The Maritime Heritage Center will be a regional cultural facility representing many maritime history organizations. In addition to the five founding organizations, there are additional interests in the city that will be represented at the center. The team identified, through a Request for Proposals (RFP), a cultural design organization for the facility integration study. Lord Cultural Resources completed the final report in August; the report addresses space utilization, implementation of interpretive themes, and an approximate layout diagram. At the beginning of the design process, the teams are concurrently examining the park layout and the museum design and programming.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like the proponents to further explain the link between the Maritime Heritage Center and SLU Park. Would like to know if there are any conflicts in this negotiated partnership.
 - Proponents stated that there is a P4- public/ private partnership. This is a publicly owned piece of land, and the team has dedicated some of it to a non-profit organization. Further stated that the challenge is the need to make the most of this partnership and protect the public rights to this property. Further stated that the City hopes that this Maritime Heritage Center is successful, but DOPAR does not want to stand by for an extended amount of time, waiting for the organization to raise funds and develop the site.
 - Proponents stated that the team hopes to keep the site accessible and open for the public to enjoy in a passive nature. Further stated that the team hopes to integrate the nautical themes throughout SLU Park and the South Lake Union area.
- Believes that this will be a wonderful amenity and facility. Feels that it will become a regional facility and the adjacent land uses would not be required to attract people to the area. Believes that this is an appropriate opportunity to develop a high-density neighborhood to border a park. Is concerned that the area peripheral to the park will be developed to create high-tech jobs.
 - Proponents stated that the purchase and sale agreement did not specify required land uses. Further stated that the property is NC-2; housing is allowed in this zone, but it would be a conditional use. Further stated that the neighborhood, during neighborhood charrettes, described a vision for the area that includes live, work, and play. The neighborhood considers SLU Park the recreational outlet. Further stated that the developer is partnering with different housing groups and developers to bring residential uses in the area. Proponents further stated that the transportation links in this area are a concern that must be addressed as this area is developed.
- Would like the team to further explain the building edge in relation to the water.
 - Proponents stated that to maintain the docked vessels, the current apron must be moved back. However, they must also maintain the near-shore environment for habitat. The apron may be moved from the building, creating an area of water between the apron and the building. Further stated that continuity must be maintained to allow the public to flow through the spaces.

- Believes that the armory building is a potentially phenomenal space, especially with the combined uses.
 - Proponents stated that the team hopes to improve the feasibility of the use of the space. Further stated that the team hopes to provide significant public benefit; there are many design opportunities to provide additional space without compromising the historic value of the armory building. The modified structure will comply with current accessibility and seismic standards.
- Believes that the Maritime Heritage Center could be a great opportunity for a permanent physical home for Seafair. Feels that it could also host festivals with a Nordic theme. Hopes that this historical space will further connect the sea with social events.
 - Proponents stated that the space must provide a dynamic public benefit to continuously attract people. Further stated that the different organizations involved will provide an opportunity for an unprecedented amount of active festivals. Further stated that the Nordic Heritage Museum may also be a potential operating partner.
- Would like to know if the team knows the development plan to the east of the site. Encourages the team to develop this project aggressively, to set the pace for adjacent developments. Hopes that this area will develop cohesively.
 - Proponents stated that the City Investors developer is interested in many potential projects. Further stated that the developer is aware of the views between the sites and of the SLU Park site.
- Believes that the historical physical nature of the site, as a landfill, should be addressed in the design concept.
- Believes that this is a good example of an open space that provides the maximum benefit for the most people. Hopes that this project can be an example of the ways by which people can live densely without destroying the landscape.
 - Proponents stated that the programming is playing a significant part in the physical design of the site. Further stated that the team is developing programs for children, and the team has realized that the activities offered will make the site exciting.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- A representative from the Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU) would like to know how the short and long distance views would be affected by this development.
 - Proponents stated that the team has identified viewpoints. This view would be protected even as the ships would be docked at the Maritime Heritage Center. The team believes that SLU Park should not be built out to form a wall. Further stated that sight lines through the site would be maintained. Further stated that the three-story armory building would provide many exciting viewpoints. The historic wharves run north-south on the north end of the building. The team hopes to enhance the sight lines from the upper areas, through Terry Avenue for example.

21 June 2001 Project: Waterfront Streetcar Improvement Project

Phase: Briefing

Presenters: Ethan Melone, Strategic Planning Office (SPO)
Dennis Haskell, Parsons BrinckerhoffAttendees: Mark Clemmens, Seattle Transportation (SeaTran)
Amy Patton, SeaTran
Nathan Torgelson, Office of Economic Development

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00236)

Action: The Commission appreciates the presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission is impressed with the opportunities that the project team has presented to integrate future and existing trolley platforms with other types of pedestrian infrastructure improvements;
- to maintain an urban experience, hopes that the buffer between the trolley and other transportation systems will be as transparent as possible; and
- believes that expansion and improvement of the Waterfront Streetcar will become a critical part of the downtown core transportation system, linking growing employment to the north and the stadiums to the south.

The Seattle waterfront has changed significantly over the past years. Historically, the waterfront has been primarily used as an industrial port. It has developed to become a mixed-use waterfront, and also hosts many cultural and recreational uses. The use of the waterfront space has also begun to extend northward and many new offices and developments are planned for this area. The Waterfront Streetcar has been operating along the waterfront since 1982, and the single track is two miles long. The track is currently constrained by its capacity; therefore, it primarily appeals to tourists.

The Strategic Planning Office (SPO) has worked to identify opportunities for improvement and extending the alignment northward, through Myrtle Edwards Park and Elliott Bay Park. Currently, there are planted buffers between the railway and the parks; the trolley may be in this buffer.

The team presented an illustration of the primary issues, conditions, and opportunities. The existing right-of-way in the buffer is fourteen feet, which is the required distance. The streetcar corridor would parallel a bike path, a meandering pedestrian path, and the railway. The bike path would have to move west to incorporate a greater buffer between these paths and the streetcar. Future development may require the locations of these paths to change, and the streetcar alignment and construction would provide an opportunity to develop an appropriate urban design response. There may be pedestrian bridge connections to Elliott Avenue at Thomas Street and Prospect Street; these would be logical locations for streetcar stations. The design of the bridge and its required vertical circulation would be integrated with the design of the streetcar station; this structure would also provide views of the waterfront and the parks. Currently, there is a streetcar barn within the future site of the Olympic Sculpture Park. This structure must move to comply with the future northern alignment.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Supports the goals of this project. Would like to hear more about the design principles and the relationship between the bike and pedestrian paths and the streetcar track. Recognizes that there is a buffer required for safety, and that the team will design a perceptible barrier. However, hopes that the team will recognize Seattle's industrial character and the opportunity to enhance this urban experience by providing enough plant material to serve as a barrier while maintaining transparency.
- Would like to know if the southern terminus of the Waterfront Streetcar would extend to Safeco Field.
 - Proponents stated that the team, to date, has examined the extension of the track to the north. The scope has been expanded to investigate the opportunities to extend south, providing special event services. Further stated the team has also explored an option to extend across Jackson Street, which would provide an easier connection to the bus tunnel and into the International District. Further stated that the streetcar barn may be located to the south.
- Would like to know if the extension would significantly increase the ridership.
 - Proponents stated that the forecasted ridership would be over the cusp of what is needed.
- Would like to know if the project team is working with Intermediate Capacity Transit (ICT) to focus efforts to integrate this system with future transportation development.
 - Proponents stated that there would likely be more coordination with ICT than the Elevated Transportation Company. Further stated that none of the projects are definite and the Waterfront Streetcar would be a valuable link with the current transportation system or a future enhanced transportation system. Further stated that the team has recognized many potential opportunities.
- Enjoys the historic streetcars and understands that more of these may be available. Would like to know if lower-cost, newer cars would provide improved, peak service to further enhance the ridership.
 - Proponents stated that the vintage streetcars provide ten minute service and they provide efficient transportation. Further stated that the existing streetcars are accessible. The cost estimates represent the difference between new and vintage streetcars; the vintage cars would cost less. Further stated that the vintage streetcars require a conductor and a driver; new streetcars would require only one operator. The track would allow new and vintage streetcars. Further stated that many people prefer the vintage streetcars.
- Would like to know if the existing maintenance facility would be demolished.
 - Proponents stated that the facility would be demolished, while the equipment inside would be salvaged. The space, now occupied by the streetcar facility and parking, would become part of Myrtle Edwards Park and the future Olympic Sculpture Park.
- Would like the team to explain how the streetcar would relate to the Sculpture Park.
 - Proponents stated that streetcar tracks would be located along City right-of-way, at the waterfront. The Seattle Art Museum property would be between Western Avenue and Elliott Avenue. City property is the parking lot between the railroad and the water. Further stated that the team hopes to create a seamless connection between the Sculpture

Park, the Waterfront Streetcar, and the water. A portion of the streetcar at Elliott Avenue may be lidded; the topography drops thirty feet from Western Avenue to Alaskan Way. A lid over the railroad tracks must be twenty-six feet.

- Believes that this is a wonderful inner-city link, which will become increasingly more important. Commends the team for their foresight.